



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/349,650	07/08/1999	NICHOLAS W. NYHAN	DYN-P-99-001	6878

23460 7590 02/27/2002

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER

JANVIER, JEAN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/349,650

Applicant(s)
Nyhan

Examiner
Jean Janvier

Group Art Unit
2162



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W. Myhre

(3) _____

(2) Mark Joy

(4) _____

Date of Interview Feb 21, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 13, and 34

Identification of prior art discussed:
Dedrick (5,724,521)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant Representative discussed the differences between the independent claims and the Dedrick reference. In particular was Dedrick's Metering Server not returning a value indicative of accessing the advertisement back to the user's computer. Applicant Representative stressed that Dedrick tracks, calculates, and stores the access information using a monitoring program stored on the user's computer, and does not receive any information back from the Metering Server. The Examiner agreed that this step does not appear to happen in the reference but that further scrutiny of the reference by the Examiner of Record would be required. The Examiner noted that if this feature could not be found the Examiner in Record would probably retract the finality of the previous action and issue a new office action. The Examiner agreed to notify the Applicant representative by the end of this month on whether the finality would be withdrawn.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

James W. Myhre
Patent Examiner